



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XII.—THE EPISODES IN SHAKESPEARE'S I. *HENRY VI.*

The present paper is drawn from a number of notes gradually collected and is intended to be one of a series of studies upon those plays of Shakespeare belonging to his earliest dramatic period. It is a period of vital interest in Shakespeare's work, because artistically it is his formative one and historically it connects our greatest dramatist with his predecessors and with characteristic contemporary fashions and productions.

Whatever may be the exact date on which Shakespeare came to town or began his dramatic career, as is well known, there were three sorts of plays current and fashionable at the time. There was the English history or chronicle play; the Senecan tragedy of blood; and the Plautean comedy of dialogue and situation,—both of these last formed upon classic models. Shakespeare is at first no innovator, but in his beginning work is connected with all these and other modes. *I. Henry VI* is an illustration of the history or chronicle play, closely followed by the Second and Third Parts and by *Richard III*. The example of the tragedy of blood based on Senecan models is *Titus Andronicus*, which, from certain points of view, is a necessary link in the chain of structural and character development from the crude Senecan imitation, through Marlowe's vehement creations and Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, to the masterful *Hamlet* and *Lear*. And thirdly, the *Comedy of Errors* is an adaptation of the bustle and wit of the Plautean comedy of sparkling dialogue and equivocal situation. But comedy was very close to the native English genius. It had perked itself up long before in the face of the sacred background in the *Noah's Wife* and the *Shepherds* of the *Miracle Plays*; and it could not be expected now that a made-to-order pseudo-classic type should pre-

scribe a stiff jacket for constant wearing. *Love's Labour's Lost* may derive ultimately from classic comedy, but is more immediately the product of artificial court-life and manners and speech best associated with the name of John Lyly. Of a phase suggesting the manner of Robert Greene, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* adopted the formal and exaggerated love *versus* friendship romance from some one of its many applications in Southern Europe.

Indeed, if anything seems to be true of the beginner Shakespeare, he is very precocious at trying conclusions with competitors of every sort and catching up any contemporary literary fashion that may be in favor. As he became better acquainted with courtiers and court-life, he wrote for the young nobles, and surely ladies, too, of London and Elizabeth's court two love narratives derived from Ovid: *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*. And it was probably not far from the same time that the young and now successful poet was led, after well-known imitations of Italian models, to indulge in the first of "his sugred sonnets among his private friends." Such was the spirit of the young Shakespeare in his early work. It is the first natural step in his development into his later individual mastery.

The play of *I. Henry VI.* shows Shakespeare under the influence of one of the earliest of these contemporary literary fashions: he is at work upon the materials for a history drama. A good plea can be made, as it is made by Mr. Halliwell-Phillips and Professor Sarrazin,¹ even if the matter cannot be definitely determined, on behalf of *I. Henry VI.* as the earliest of all the early works ascribed to Shakespeare. Certainly the history play is the form in which Shakespeare's genius first fruited and soonest became exhausted. It cannot have been far from the historic year of the Spanish Armada that Shakespeare began his literary work in London. While

¹ J. O. Halliwell-Phillips: *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, 1890, 9th ed., vol. I, p. 97. G. Sarrazin: *William Shakespeare's Lehrjahre*, 1897.

in isolated existence and in a crude form before, the vogue of the history play, its great temporary popularity and as sudden dying down after ten years of life (1589-1599), can be traced directly to the national feeling evoked by the victories of the English over the Spanish in the eventful year of 1588. The new victories over Spain would naturally recall the ancient glory of the victories of brave Talbot over the French; or the accounts in the chronicles may have been brought afresh to mind by existing disturbances in France. An older play may or may not have existed on the subject. It may be that it is an older play that is referred to by Nash in *Pierce Penniless*, or it may be that it is *I. Henry VI.* In any case, it was a subject that could now be presented and could be counted upon to arouse national spirit and popular enthusiasm. *I. Henry VI.* breathes at every pore this patriotic atmosphere.

Omitting *Henry VIII.*, which was written near the close of the dramatist's career and which occupies a peculiar place in his work, there are nine history plays connected with Shakespeare's name. These fall into two groups closely related in subject, each group consisting of four plays and thus forming a sort of tetralogy. The two tetralogies may be regarded as connected by the remaining play as intermediate in point of development and structure and power of characterization. The first group or tetralogy contains *I.*, *II.*, and *III. Henry VI.* and *Richard III.* This group deals with the troublous times of the Wars of the Roses which culminate in the cruel and monstrous Richard. One wicked king may suggest another, particularly if a play already exists on the subject and can be readily worked over, compressed into shape, and the characters, instead of being pulled about on strings, be made to live. *King John*, therefore, falls between the two groups; and in method of construction and character development is to be compared with the two Richards, one on each hand and both showing the very different influence of Marlowe's two manners. The second

tetralogy goes back in subject to take up the original cause of these fateful quarrels; and this is treated in a freer, broader, and maturer spirit in *Richard II.*, *I.* and *II. Henry IV.*, and *Henry V.* A little offshoot from the Falstaff scenes of *Henry IV.* is the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. The one group ends where the other begins: *Henry V.* closes with the crowning of the king in Paris; *I. Henry VI.* opens with the burial of *Henry V.* in Westminster Abbey and the woes ensuing from his coronation. The closing words of the Chorus as Epilogue to *Henry V.* seems to lay particular emphasis upon this connection and to take evident pleasure in the thought of work complete, and of a series brought at length to a termination.

Thus considered *I. Henry VI.* becomes a part of an apparently larger and more completely developed whole, and constitutes possibly the first play in Shakespeare's "bending" to prevailing fashions. But the play not only rewards examination in this larger spirit; looked at for itself in structure and form it is no less interesting. An analysis of *I. Henry VI.* shows not the close fusion of parts into a spiritual whole as in a later play like *Much Ado* or *King Lear*, or even in a comparatively early play like the *Merchant of Venice* or *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. There are not a few passages of no mean rhetorical power, more, indeed, than is generally supposed, but the play as a whole is structurally weak. There is little elaboration of character or development of plot. The play is characterized by the loose putting together of parts; each part being but the result of a succession or stringing together of scenes or episodes.

Briefly and generally stated, just as in the outward form of *The Shrew*, of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, of the *Merchant of Venice*, of *Henry IV.*, of *Much Ado about Nothing*, of *King Lear*, of *Cymbeline*—plays taken from very different periods of Shakespeare's work—so in the structure of *I. Henry VI.* there are two leading parts into which the play falls. These

two parts may be generally designated as the Talbot or French portion and the Henry or English portion.

As the Folio edition gives the play there are twenty-seven scenes. By separating the episode of the wooing of Margaret by Suffolk from the Joan episode that immediately precedes, as independent by its very content, there will be twenty-eight. Of these twenty-eight scenes at least sixteen belong to the Talbot part, eight to the Henry part, and the remaining four serve to connect and weld these together. Of these four one is about, and two others intimately concerned with, the Talbot wars; the fourth is the scene of the wooing of Margaret. Also two of the eight Henry scenes transfer the English king to France, and may be treated as connecting scenes; certainly, as will be shown, they bear a peculiar relation one to the other.

The French War or Talbot portion, into which the Joan of Arc scenes naturally fall, is thus apparently the original basis of the play. It is more closely related to the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall, and apart from specific exceptions presently to be noted, is the more archaic in manner and principle. Upon this Talbot part as ground stock is grafted the Henry part—the scenes comprising the quarrels of the nobles. The general jealousy between Gloucester and Winchester—at the Abbey, at the Tower, in the Parliament and in the Palace of the King—passes over into the specific enmity between Plantagenet and Somerset in the Temple Garden, followed at once by the death of Mortimer and bringing in its train all the horrors the factions of the Red and White Roses entail. These are hardly one-half so many as the Talbot scenes, but they are among the longest and most independently developed scenes in the play.

Also the four connecting or welding scenes, which bring the Talbot episodes into connection with the others, are largely independent and free in development. For instance, the long opening scene of the First Act is an introduction to the general situation. The accounts of the three messen-

gers arriving in succession interrupt the quarrels of the nobles and tell of Talbot's distress. By the simple device of the messengers, taken from the old Senecan tragedy to serve as chorus, the English and the French parts are brought together at the opening of the play. Again, into the midst of the Fourth Act, where the death of Talbot is developed out of all due proportion, but in a distinctly elevated strain, by a poet who shows at once both lyric and dramatic power, two other connecting scenes are thrust. Scenes 3 and 4 of this Act are absolutely parallel in construction: Sir William Lucy appeals to both York and Somerset for succor in vain, and the death of Talbot is ascribed not to the French and to Joan, but to the jealousies and quarrels of the parties of the Red and the White Rose. And in the last Act occurs the final connecting scene: the wooing of Margaret by Suffolk. It is an episode of the battlefield; yet it is at the same time but another element of discord among the nobles: Suffolk becomes an influence in moving the King's choice in opposition to Gloucester. But this episode has a deeper significance than helping to connect the Talbot and Henry portions of the drama: it prepares intimately for Parts II. and III. of *Henry VI.*, wherein Margaret and her guilty love fill so large a part. Suffolk's speech:

"Thus Suffolk hath prevailed; and thus he goes, . . .
 Margaret shall now be queen, and rule the king;
 But I will rule both her, the king, and realm"—

are the last words of Part I., and a sombre note is struck as the curtain falls. If ever there was intentional preparation for matter to come, it is surely here. So close is the connection that a recent editor (Donovan) ends the first play prematurely and places the concluding portion of the last scene as the beginning of the Second Part. It is the figure of Margaret, amid the jarring contentions of parties, that moves sombrely through the four plays and binds the first tetralogy into a single whole—one ultimate consistent concep-

tion, though of unequal execution. Unhistorically, but poetically enough, the wooing of Margaret by Suffolk is placed near the close of the First Part of *Henry VI.* and prepares for Parts II. and III. Unhistorically again, the figure of Margaret appears in the fourth play, in *Richard III.*, like a weird figure of Fate, proclaiming curses and vengeance.

Not that the whole plan was seen from the beginning. It gradually grew out of the material at hand. Part I. prepared for Parts II. and III.; Parts II. and III. are intimately connected; and *Richard III.* completed Part III. Or there may have been a different order of writing. So specifically does I. prepare for II. and III. in certain particulars that it is conceivable that I. was written after II. and that III. had been already planned.¹ Without entering here upon the difficult question of the relation of the Quartos to the Folio version of II. and III. *Henry VI.*, Parts II. and III. may have existed in an incomplete shape before *I. Henry VI.* assumed its present form. The author saw the dramatic possibilities in these Wars of the Roses in the reign of Henry VI. Part I., therefore, could be made to serve as introduction. The Talbot material already well-known and existing in chronicle form, even if not, as is probable, as an old play, could be compressed, altered, and added to, and other non-chronicle parts introduced. The Henry, and particularly the Margaret, episodes became emphasized to accord with the two plays, the early forms of II. and III. *Henry VI.*, already existing. Finally, *Richard III.* served as conclusion, after II. and III. had been put into final form. Such would be a conceivable hypothesis as to the relation of Part I. to Parts II. and III.

At any rate, whatever may be the precise order and dates of these several plays brought in question, the method and spirit of the writing of *I. Henry VI.* hardly admits of doubt.

¹ Mr. Richard Grant White has a suggestion akin to this in his "Essay on the authorship of King Henry the Sixth."

To work up or rewrite the Talbot portions of the Chronicles, probably, though not necessarily, already crystallized into an old play on the triumph of "brave Talbot" over the French, which possessed the hated Joan of Arc scenes and all; to intensify the figure and character of Talbot; to work over or add scenes like those touching Talbot's death; to connect him with the deplorable struggles of the nobles; to invent, by a happy poetical thought, the origin of the factions of the Red and White Roses in the Temple Garden; to sound at once the note of weakness in the king continued in the succeeding Parts, and thus convert the old Talbot material effectually into a Henry VI. drama; and to close with the wooing of Margaret as specific introduction to Part II.,—something like this seems the task that the dramatist set himself to perform.

Such a process as this mingling of themes in *I. Henry VI.* best accounts for obvious difficulties: the confusion of dates, chronological disorders, and more than one bewildering repetition of the same event. The portrayal of the death of Talbot before the marriage of the king to Margaret is historically an anomaly, but dramatically easily understood. Also the return of the Duke of Burgundy to the French occurred historically after the death of Joan and was in no wise caused by her; but there seems to have been some traditional or chronicle authority for the episode, apart from the freshness and spirit of the dramatic conception of the passage. Certain obscurities of reference may likewise be the result of the condensation of the old Talbot parts, just as in *King John* some of the deeds and words of the Bastard Faulconbridge are to be referred to the older play for proper understanding. Such may be a possible explanation of a vagueness in the presentation of the figures of the Master Gunner and his Boy, and of certain peculiarities in the structure of the Joan episodes as well as in the conception of the character of Joan herself. There is a seeming contradiction or anomaly in two references to Winchester as

Cardinal in the First and Fifth Acts respectively. In the quarrel at the Tower in Act I., when Gloucester wishes to stamp the Cardinal's hat under his feet, Winchester is addressed as Cardinal. In Act V. Exeter is surprised to know that Winchester is become Cardinal and to see the habiliments of office :

"What! is my Lord of Winchester install'd
And call'd unto a cardinal's degree?"

There is suggested at once that some of the contradictions and repetitions in the play can hardly be due to anything else than to writing over existing dramatic material in new forms and keeping some parts of the old side by side. The strongest internal evidence of the probable existence of an older Talbot play seems to rest here; although one must be careful in drawing too rigid conclusions from the structure of a play that admittedly belongs to a formative period and nowhere applies very closely the laws of sequence and consistency.

As explained the opening scene of the play seems to serve for connecting the two main parts or plots of the drama. The narrative of the messengers jumbles together events wide apart in order to set forth the sum total of results. The capture of cities at various stages of the war and in different years are dramatically brought together in one breath. The method is not that of narrative or chronicle, but chronicle transformed into drama. So far good; for this is the usual procedure of the chronicle play. But the content of the third messenger's speech touches material that is later specifically enacted in Acts II. and III.: he relates the circumstances of Talbot's valor and, in sharp contrast therewith, the story of Fastolfe's cowardice :

.... "valiant Talbot above human thought
Enacted wonders with his sword and lance:
Hundreds he sent to hell, and none durst stand him;
Here, there, and every where, enraged he flew:
The French exclaim'd, the devil was in arms;

All the whole army stood agazed on him :
 His soldiers spying his undaunted spirit
 A Talbot ! a Talbot ! cried out amain
 And rush'd into the bowels of the battle.
 Here had the conquest fully been seal'd up,
 If Sir John Fastolfe had not play'd the coward :
 He, being in the vaward, placed behind
 With purpose to relieve and follow them,
 Cowardly fled, not having struck one stroke." (I. i. 121-134.)

This is reported as having occurred upon "Retiring from the siege of Orleans." Now Scene I. of the following Act is laid "before Orleans." In close agreement with Holinshead and Hall, the stage directions read : "Cry : 'St. George,' 'A Talbot.' The French leap over the walls in their shirts;" and the Bastard of Orleans comments : "I think this Talbot be a fiend of hell" (II. i. 38-46). The same episode is once more repeated a few lines further : "Alarum. Enter an English Soldier, crying 'A Talbot ! a Talbot !' They fly, leaving their clothes behind;" while one of the English soldiers declares, "The cry of Talbot serves me for a sword" (II. i. 77-81). The scene in Act II. seems to be the older, upon which is based the Messenger episode. The account of the Messenger is written for the special purpose of introducing the play, and the two versions are allowed to stand side by side in succeeding Acts. Indeed, all the accounts of Talbot's deeds of valor, multiplied, as if to gain force by iteration, bear a general resemblance.

But the four mystifying repetitions of Fastolfe's cowardice attest even more pointedly this working-over process. The several incidents seem to have been drawn from an episode in an old play based upon the Chronicles, and perhaps still need the old play to be perfectly explained. As related, the Messenger recounts the Fastolfe episode in the opening scene, as happening when the English were "retiring from the siege of Orleans." There it is narrative. Upon release as prisoner, Talbot himself expresses the same feelings about Fastolfe crying out in utter indignation :

"But, O! the treacherous Fastolfe wounds my heart,
Whom with my bare fists I would execute,
If I now had him brought into my power." (I. iv. 35-37.)

This is in perfect accord with the narration of the Messenger and is evidently connected with the latter. It is one of Talbot's first utterances after appearing on the stage. It occurs in the scene with the obscure Master Gunner and his Boy. It interrupts the sequence like a passionate outburst, and stands isolated. Taking this remark with the spirited second speech containing the extravagant description¹ of Talbot's treatment among the French there is the feeling that both speeches have been worked over and intensified, consistently with what the Messenger has told, to gain a stronger impression of Talbot's character.

In this aspect the second reference to Fastolfe is directly dependent upon the first. This cannot be said of the third, however. Act III. enacts before our eyes the scene already told of and once again referred to in Act I. It is incorporated in the second scene and is supposed to occur this time before Rouen.

¹ "In open market-place produced they me,
To be a public spectacle to all:
Here, said they, is the terror of the French,
The scarecrow that affrights our children so.
Then broke I from the officers that led me,
And with my nails digg'd stones out of the ground,
To hurl at the beholders of my shame:
My grisly countenance made others fly;
None durst come near for fear of sudden death.
In iron walls they deem'd me not secure;
So great fear of my name 'mongst them was spread
That they supposed I could rend bars of steel
And spurn in pieces posts of adamant:
Wherefore a guard of chosen shot I had
That walked about me every minute while;
And if I did but stir out of my bed,
Ready they were to shoot me to the heart." (I. iv. 40-56.)

"An alarm: excursions. Enter Sir John Fastolfe and a Captain.

Cap. Whither away, Sir John Fastolfe, in such haste?

Fast. Whither away! to save myself by flight:

We are like to have the overthrow again.

Cap. What! will you fly, and leave Lord Talbot?

Fast. Ay,

All the Talbots in the world to save my life. [Exit.

Cap. Cowardly knight! ill fortune follow thee!" [Exit.

(III. ii. 104-108.)

Fourth and last, in the first scene of Act IV., which, as we shall see later, shows other signs of having been developed from the scene immediately preceding (III. 4), by the addition of new material and a fresh spirit, there is still another account of the Fastolfe incident. It is this last account that follows the details of the Chronicle most closely. As Fastolfe bears a letter from the recreant Duke of Burgundy to the young English king, Talbot tears the Garter from Fastolfe's leg and bursts forth:

"Shame to the Duke of Burgundy and thee!

I vow'd, base knight, when I did meet thee next,

To tear the garter from thy craven's leg, . . . ,

This dastard, at the battle of Patay, . . .

Like to a trusty squire did run away. . . ." (IV. i. 13-26.)

The Chronicle supports Talbot in placing the occurrence at the battle of Patay. True, the Folio has "Poitiers," but this is an obvious slip. But in the play the episode is given not once but thrice and as occurring at different places. Clearly all instances grew from one.

The tribute to the Knights of the Garter, that, it is needless to say, has no parallel in the Chronicle and presumably also not in the older play, and which Shakespeare again touches upon in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, seems to have been the particular occasion for this last special mention of the Fastolfe episode. In it Talbot reaches a patriotic strain as distinct, if not yet so noble, as the spirit of Faulconbridge in *King John* and of the dying John of Gaunt in *Richard II.* It was this Fastolfe episode that Shakespeare seems still to

have had in mind, when, later, in *Henry IV.*, his creative power, no longer shackled by the mechanical necessity of piling scene on scene, made apparently out of this germ certain of the Falstaff scenes. From Sir John Fastolfe to Sir John Falstaff is a slight change in letters—a change actually made by the Folio spelling, which has “Falstaffe”—and at least one of the spellings in the Chronicles also transposes the l and the s. After “Oldcastle” had been given up, and another name looked for, here was one at hand. And the running away at Shrewsbury is not very unlike the running away at Patay; yet what a difference in the genius of the two! Another point of contact may be mentioned. Henry VI. dismisses Fastolfe in these words:

“Be packing, therefore, thou that wast a knight:
Henceforth we banish thee, on pain of death.” (IV. i. 46, 47.)

There was a fat, white-haired old knight to whom another royal speech was made:

“I know thee not, old man: fall to thy prayers; . . .

and with the very words:

“I banish thee, on pain of death.”
(Second Henry IV., V. v.)

As intimated, the freely developed scene i of Act IV. bears a curious relation to the final short scene of Act III. The two scenes must be reckoned together. In the tabular statement above they were counted as belonging to the Henry and English portion; but with perhaps better reason they would be treated as welding and connecting parts. Both have the King in Paris; both have identically the same actors; both have the same two situations, viz., Talbot's interview with the King, and the quarrel of Vernon and Bassett, the followers respectively of York and Somerset. But the second scene is developed far beyond the former, and the spirit of the two is equally different. One is condensed and compressed; the other elaborated and heightened by fresh details. In place

of the former bareness, in the new scene the King is ready for coronation and a fictitious Governor of Paris, who, however, does not appear, is addressed. Gloucester takes a prominent part in directing; Talbot throws the insult upon Fastolfe, for the fourth time repeated, and pays the tribute to the Knights of the Garter; the disaffection of the Duke of Burgundy is discussed in council and a plan of action determined upon; Vernon and Bassett, the respective champions of York and Somerset, lay their quarrel in detail before the King, whereupon even fiery, immoderate Gloucester becomes for the nonce peacemaker:

"Confounded be your strife!
And perish ye, with your audacious prate!"

(IV. i. 123, 124.)

The King has his chance to "play the orator," not unlike the later opening scene of *Richard II.*, seeking to quiet the strife of subjects; and Exeter's prophetic notes close the episode. A well-packed and strong scene it is, unquestionably. The newer scene seems to have been suggested by and worked out of the former; but even after this had been done the former crude and undeveloped one was still left side by side as introductory.

There are other indications that point to the existence of an older Talbot play. The Talbot portion of the play stands generally much lower in spirit and in average excellence. Some part of this impression comes from its necessary character. The bustle and confusion of battle, the passing in and out of English and French soldiers, the scraps of French, the cheap references to classic mythology and tradition—all combine to give an archaic impression to the style. The many references to "Hunger" are an almost necessary implication from the scenes of war and are touches possibly derived from an older Talbot play. They can hardly be, as Professor Sarrazin seems almost to intimate, a reflex of Shakespeare's own starving condition in his early London years. Likewise,

the religious expressions that fall from Talbot's lips, natural as they are for intensifying one who was the chief hero of an old play, have an archaic sound and are apparently stray notes from older material. Luther-like, Talbot exclaims (II. i. 26), "God is our fortress;" and in his report to the King in the clearly older of the two scenes discussed (III. iv. 11, 12), he

"Ascribes the glory of his conquest got
First to my God and next unto your grace."

Quite out of the same intense spirit of narrow patriotism would come the crude, disdainful and insulting references to the enemy, all belonging to the French war episodes. In this way is best understood the conception of the Joan of Arc scenes. All of the few touches added here and there to her characterization seem fresher and more modern. Many of the barer references to the simple home and country life of the day could also possibly be traced back to older material. It is not the reference in itself to the country and to Nature, but the aptness and freshness and spirit that we feel is the mark of the young Shakespeare. The illustrations may be seen in the quotations collected by Professor Sarrazin in his excellent monograph on *I. Henry VI.* in *William Shakespeare's Lehrjahre*, although the author is not inclined to make any such distinctions. But a difference in treatment in different parts is very evident, which shows at least tendencies and influences.

The scenes of the Talbot portions are usually derived from the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall, the epitaph of Talbot, and probably one or two other isolated sources;¹ and the frequent compressions and omissions, and occasional expansions, may best be explained, as in *King John*, by the intervention of an intermediate play. Such an expansion is the episode of the Countess of Auvergne. The episode is

¹ See *Shakespeare's Holinshed*, by W. G. Boswell-Stone, 1896, which gives in detail the treatment of the sources in the play as we now have it.

not found in Holinshed and Hall, and as the play stands, it is both clumsily and unnecessarily introduced. It is prominent in position, but unsatisfactory in effect. It is designed to emphasize Talbot's valor and resource, as would befit a play specifically on Talbot's bravery, but seems too crude to have been developed of itself from the context and by the creator of the two scenes that immediately follow: the plucking of the roses in the Temple Garden and the death of Mortimer. The episode seems based on an old *motif* and recalls similar traditions from the Robin Hood and Alexander¹ legends, and the Samson and Delilah story in the Bible. It concludes scene ii and fills all of scene iii in Act II. The obsequies of Salisbury over, the usual Senecan figure of the Messenger enters and inquires for "the warlike Talbot." The Queen of Sheba desired to see Solomon in all his glory, and "the virtuous lady, Countess of Auvergne," craves the presence of Talbot in her castle. This close of scene ii is the introduction to the scene that follows. The countess gives her porter instructions:

"The plot is laid: if all things fall out right,
I shall as famous be by this exploit
As Seythian Tomyris by Cyrus' death." (II. iii. 4-6.)

Talbot securely within doors, she calls him her prisoner; but the hero 'winds his horn,' his soldiers break in, and the Countess and her plotters are confounded. Not, however, before the Countess and Talbot have indulged in a quibble on the conceit of "the shadow" and "the substance."

Countess: Long time thy shadow hath been thrall to me. . . .
But now thy substance shall endure the like. . . .

Talbot: No, no, I am but shadow of myself;
You are deceived, my substance is not here; . . . etc.
(II. iii. 36-63.)

¹In the *Wars of Alexander*, edited by W. W. Skeat, E. E. T. S., Extra Series, XLVII, pp. 264-265, Alexander is taken prisoner by Candace and quails before her. As in the story of Delilah the episode shows the woman's wit rather than the hero's resource.

It is a quibble that Hamlet engages in with his Wittenberg university friends, Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, though not at such intolerable length, and Schmidt's *Lexicon* will show many others. We are almost on the ground of the verbal quibbles in *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Comedy of Errors*, and other early comedies; only, bad as many of these latter are, they are fresher and more concise in treatment. It may be that the young Shakespeare found this episode in the old play and with the inveterate love for word-punning in his early work, sounded the many changes on these words. In a later scene in the play the same figure is again employed—this time more happily and poetically—in connection with the terms of peace offered to the French King:

“Must he be then as shadow of himself?
Adorn his temples with a coronet,
And yet in substance and authority,
Retain but privilege of a private man?”

(V. iv. 133-136.)

In one or two places in the Joan episodes expansions and additions beyond the chronicle narrative can be observed. In Joan's first appearance at the French Court there are one or two lines of freshness, of which distinctly the best are those of the concluding speech, I. ii.:

“Expect Saint Martin's summer, halcyon days,
Since I have entered into these wars.
Glory is like a circle in the water
Which never ceaseth to enlarge itself
Till by broad spreading it disperse to nought.”

(I. ii. 131-135.)

But it is in the interview with the Duke of Burgundy (III. iii.) that Joan is at her best. She breathes a patriotic spirit in appealing to his love of country, his pride, his self-interest, to return to the bosom of his bleeding land. The patriotism is as marked, albeit in a greater lyric strain befitting the woman's voice, as the martial tone of Talbot in the Garter scene before the Knights of England. The episode

has something of the spirit of the best scenes, but its effect is immediately destroyed by the exclamation: "Done like a Frenchman: turn, and turn again!" Here we are back at the old commonplace again!

The interview between Joan and her father (V. iv. ll. 2-33) is also not in the Chronicle. The thirty lines undoubtedly display something of the same pathos between parent and child that the death-scene of Talbot shows. It is a development, but just as the Countess of Auvergne episode is a development. Compared with the enthusiasm of Talbot's feelings in the corresponding scene, it seems archaic in spirit and method, and apparently with the other Joan episodes must be based upon the older Talbot material. Joan's soliloquy (V. iii), calling upon "ye charming spells and periapts," is in the same category. It falls far below the very little later Shakespeare, as it falls below Schiller's lyric monologue in the *Jungfrau*, which was yet evidently inspired by it.

The death of Talbot and the tenderness and love of the hero for his son gave the poet—creator or reviser—opportunity for extended idyllic treatment. Scenes ii to vii inclusive, of the Fourth Act, fall together for this purpose. They are developed out of the Talbot parts, and in contrast with the compression and obscurity at other points have been worked out in the fullest detail. The work is done, too, in a way to effect a closer union between the Talbot and the Henry portions. The first of the six scenes strikes the note of those to follow: it consists of three solemn speeches, by Talbot, by the opposing General who is not named, and again by Talbot. The thought is a repetition, a summary of the ideas as to Talbot's character, already often expressed, but here more highly figurative and poetic. There is a softer and more flexible spirit brought out than in the stern Talbot we have had before, and it finds fitting lyric expression. Talbot's comparison of his position with

"A little herd of England's timorous deer,
Mazed with a yelping kennel of French curs!"

(IV. ii. 46, 47.)

stirs a sympathetic note.

The next two scenes are mere pendants, each necessary for the other, but in themselves serving only to develop the episode of the death and draw out the closing scenes to greater length so as to become more effective. In each Sir William Lucy enters; he urges York in the one and Somerset in the other to haste to the aid of Talbot; but mutual jealousy keeps them still. Thus Talbot's fate is dramatically determined by the quarrel of the roses in the Temple Garden :

"The fraud of England, not the force of France,
Hath now entrapp'd the noble-minded Talbot."

(IV. iv. 36, 37.)

It is one of the first blights of the struggle between the Red and the White Rose.

Again, scene v and scene vi are parallel. The two scenes portray at length the love of father and son, and prepare for the climax reserved for the last scene. It seems as if the poet wished to dwell upon the circumstance and to repeat himself again and again. The dialogue between father and son reveals this elaboration. It begins in blank verse, but quickly turns into rime, and into rime for a purpose: to bring out the lyrical accent of the lament. It is as if after the first speech between the two in blank verse, the idea must be iterated and reiterated, and rime is necessary for this. It is at this point in scene v that the feeling seems to reach a climax. It is a Damon and Pythias or David and Jonathan sort of friendship, almost more than the tie that binds father and son, which finds lyrical expression. In its repetition of various phases and elaboration of the sentiment it recalls the strong scene between father and son in the rugged, early Brome play of Abraham and Isaac. The expression of the mutual love and devotion of father and son is strengthened by the conscious form employed: the stichomythia or rapid

succession of speech and reply united to rime. The intensifying effect is evident :

- Tal.* "If we both stay, we both are sure to die.
John. Then let me stay; and, father, do you fly. . . .
Tal. Shall all thy mother's hopes lie in one tomb?
John. Ay, rather than I'll shame my mother's womb.
Tal. Upon my blessing, I command thee go.
John. To fight I will, but not to fly the foe.
Tal. Part of thy father may be saved in thee.
John. No part of him but will be shame in me." (IV. v. 20-39.)

The two scenes have the same situation; except that one is before battle and the other in the midst of it. The very repetition strikes a deeper note and emphasizes the desperateness of the situation.

Last scene of all is the death of both son and father. The comparison with Icarus is repeated, and Talbot's last words over his fallen son are full of the conceits of metaphysical poetry, characteristic of passages in this play, in many of the early undoubted Shakespeare plays, as well as in other productions of the time :

- "Brave death by speaking, whether he will or no;
 Imagine him a Frenchman and thy foe.
 Poor boy! he smiles, methinks, as who should say,
 Had death been French, then death had died to-day. . . .
 Soldiers, adieu! I have what I would have,
 Now my old arms are young John Talbot's grave." (IV. vii. 25-32.)

All the critics have pointed out the similarity of this last line to a passage in Part III., and of both to a line in Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*: "These arms of mine shall be thy sepulchre" (l. 1160).

In the divisions into scenes, this scene might have ended here, and a new one have begun. The reference to the quarrels of York and Somerset gives the connection. The cry of the father's love for his child, however overwrought and extravagant, is the clearest single note struck in the whole play amid the jar of quarrels and the rush of battle.

Yet how far away we are from Lear's cry over Cordelia dead in his arms :

"Howl, howl, howl, howl! O, you are men of stones:
Had I your tongues and eyes, I'd use them so
That Heaven's vault should crack. She's gone forever!"
(V. iii. 257-259.)

Repetitions of episodes and situations become so frequent in the play that they are a characteristic feature of the structure and style. The repetition is often avowed and of purpose; sometimes it is derived from old forms of the Senecan tragedy and designed as a mere accumulation of horror or intensifying of effect. Take the device of the three messengers in Act I., scene i., coming in one after another recounting disasters. Misfortunes never come single. This is repeated in *Richard III.* where there are four messengers instead of three. Also in *Richard III.* there are two wooing scenes under similar revolting conditions; three women sitting in a row lamenting the taking off of their dear ones; and the long array of ghosts that pass Richard's tent in solemn pageant. In this sort of tragedy mere number counts.

In *I. Henry VI.* there are numerous examples of both avowed and unconscious repetition. In Act I., scene iv Talbot soliloquizes over "Old Salisbury," "mirror of all martial men," with the usual conceits of style:

"One eye thou hast, to look to heaven for grace:
The sun with one eye vieweth all the world." (I. iv. 83, 84.)

In Act II., scene ii. Talbot performs the obsequies of Salisbury in Orleans. In the corresponding scene of the next act (III. ii.) he orders the obsequies of Bedford in Rouen:

"A braver soldier never couched lance,
A gentler heart did never sway in court."
(III. ii. 134, 135.)

Act III., scene i. closes with a didactic soliloquy of Exeter's, who, like a chorus for the play, comments on the dissensions among the nobles:

"As fester'd members rot but by degree,
Till bones and flesh and sinews fall away,
So will this base and envious discord breed."

(III. i. 192-194.)

Precisely one act later the first scene of Act IV. closes in the same way: Exeter is again alone and soliloquizes on division and discord.

Nearly all the scenes have the same construction and end in formal monologues, or summarizing or anticipatory speeches. The first scene of the First Act closes formally as it was introduced: with a speech parallel in structure from each of the four Dukes who introduce the scene as mourners about Henry's funeral, aptly characterized by Mr. Wendell as an "operatic quartette."¹ In Act I. the French King Charles closes ii. and iv.; Talbot iv. and v., the latter a monologue; the Mayor of London, who is made a comical figure, iii. In Act II., scenes iv. and v. are both closed by Plantagenet, the latter in formal monologue form. In Act III., scene i. ends with Exeter's soliloquy; ii. with Talbot's tribute to Bedford. In Act IV., i. ends with Exeter's soliloquy again; iii. and iv. with Sir William Lucy; and ii., v., vi., and the death scene in vii. with Talbot. In Act V., iii. and v. end with Suffolk and iv. with York.

Exeter's genius at presaging evil is apparent, and he recalls a prophecy of ill on Henry:

"Which in the time of Henry named the Fifth
Was in the mouth of every sucking babe." (III. i. 196, 197.)

In a later act he recalls another prophecy on Cardinal Winchester:

"Henry the Fifth did sometime prophesy,
'If once he came to be a cardinal,
He'll make his cap co-equal with the crown.'" (V. i. 31-33.)

There are other prophecies in the play. King Henry remembers a speech of his father, dramatically justified in the

¹ Barrett Wendell: *William Shakspeare*, 1894, p. 78.

tenor of the play, but actually incongruous, as the young king was but "an infant nine months old" at Henry V.'s death.

The greatest prophecy is that of Warwick in the Temple Garden (II. iv. 124-127); and this is answered in York's spirited outburst of rhetoric in the last Act addressed to Warwick and anticipating other tragedies to come:

"Is all our travail turn'd to this effect?

O, Warwick! Warwick! I foresee with grief
The utter loss of all the realm of France."

(V. iv. 102-112.)

The most poetical instance of this distinct monologue form is in the scene freely invented, where the dying Mortimer is brought in on a chair by his gaolers at the Tower. Everything in these words seem frankly Shakespearean:

"Kind keepers of my weak, decaying age,
Let dying Mortimer here rest himself.
Even like a man new haled from the rack,
So fare my limbs with long imprisonment;
And these grey locks, the pursuivants of death,
Nestor-like aged in an age of care,
Argue the end of Edmund Mortimer. . . .
Just death, kind umpire of men's miseries,
With sweet enlargement doth dismiss me hence."

(II. v. 1-16; 28-30.)

The scene closes with the same soliloquy form, this time by Richard Plantagenet:

"And peace, no war, befall thy parting soul!
In prison hast thou spent a pilgrimage
And like a hermit overpass'd thy days. . . .
Here dies the dusky torch of Mortimer,
Choked with ambition of the meaner sort."

(II. v. 115-117; 122, 123.)

Tenderness between parent and child is a thought reiterated: strongest between Talbot and young John, it is expressed by the father of Joan towards his child, and intimated in the slightly developed figures of the Master Gunner and his Boy.

Quarrels break out everywhere. Those between Gloucester and Winchester sound above the laments over the dead king at his funeral in the Abbey. They break out afresh at the Tower, in the Parliament House at the coronation, even at the end in the King's Palace, and continue into Part II. It is only a reflection and intensifying of this first quarrel to introduce the later quarrels of the Red and White Roses; and after the chief scene in the Temple Garden between Somerset and Plantagenet, it is the veritablest echo to have the entirely superfluous quarrel of their followers, Vernon and Bassett, and, too, unnecessarily repeated.

The two scenes between Gloucester and Winchester at the Tower and at the Parliament are closely alike in their structural development. The same situation with Gloucester and Winchester and their followers is repeated, but in the second instance the hurly-burly is only a part of a larger and more complex situation. One prepared for the other and suggested merely certain features. The hurly-burly between the followers of Gloucester and Winchester is as noisy as the quarrels of the Montagu and Capulet factions in the streets of Verona, and the Mayor, drawn as a comical figure and as clownish as the Serving Men he chides, rushes in in both scenes to put an end to the uproar :

"Good God, these nobles should such stomachs bear!
I myself fight not once in forty year." (I. iii. 89, 90.)

Again he complains :

"Our windows are broke down in every street
And we for fear compell'd to shut our shops."
(III. i. 84, 85.)

Probably enough the Mayor and the corporation, in deserving this portraiture, were not altogether favorable to the theatre companies. The attitude of the play towards the mob, "the many headed multitude," is the same as that in the Jack Cade scenes in Part II., the same attitude as in *Henry IV.*, in *Julius Caesar*, and in *Coriolanus*.

The Temple Garden scene is a new and specific development of the old quarrel among the nobles. For the rest of the play the double quarrels exist side by side, those of Gloucester and Winchester yielding in interest to those between Somerset and Plantagenet. The poetical happiness of the episode of the plucking of the Red and White Roses has been often admired. Analyzed it contains the usual stylistic and metrical characteristics of the undoubted early Shakespeare plays. It is full of plays on words, uses of conceits, epithets, comparisons, antitheses, repartee, stichomythia, and various figures of speech and rhetorical tricks—the characteristics¹ generally of the Henry and English portions of the play. Warwick's speech in his indisposition to commit himself, is characteristic of this freshness of spirit:²

"Between two hawks, which flies the higher pitch;
Between two dogs, which hath the deeper mouth;
Between two blades, which bears the better temper;
Between two horses, which doth bear him best;
Between two girls, which hath the merriest eye;
I have perhaps some shallow spirit of judgement; . . .
But in these nice, sharp quillets of the law,
Good faith, I am no wiser than a daw." (If. iv. 11-18.)

An apt illustration of the elaboration of a conceit may be found in the retort of Somerset and Vernon [the plucking of the red and the white roses is referred to]:

¹ Illustrations of the metrical and rhetorical peculiarities of the play are abundantly given in the pages of Professor Sarrazin: *William Shakespeare's Lehrjahre*, 1897; Goswin König: *Der Vers in Shakspeare's Dramen*, 1888; Leopold Wurth: *Das Wortspiel bei Shakspeare*, 1895; M. Basse: *Stylaffectatie bij Shakespeare*, 1895; G. Kramer: *Die Anwendung der Stichomythie neben Gleichklang bei Shakespeare*.

² This speech of Warwick and Talbot's comparison of his position with "a little head of England's timorous deer," on page 308, are the two passages cited at the meeting of the Modern Language Association by Prof. Hulme from Madden's *Diary of Master William Silence*. See *Modern Language Notes*, Feb. 1900. Both passages occur in the parts clearly added and worked into the older play, according to the foregoing analysis.

Som. Prick not your fingers as you pluck it off,
Lest bleeding you do paint the white rose red
And fall on my side so, against your will.

Vern. If I, my lord, for my opinion bleed,
Opinion shall be surgeon to my heart
And keep me on the side where still I am.

(II. iv. 49-54.)

And this spirited manner of speech continues through many lines.

Most of the critics ordinarily speak of the rose scene as poetical and worthy of Shakespeare, but give less thought to the following one of the dying Mortimer and hardly any to the Parliament scene that comes hard upon this in opening a new Act. Yet, from an investigation by one of my students, all three scenes, which belong to the Henry portion of the play, seem to agree very nearly in uniformity of mere mechanical and metrical execution. The real difference lies in the poetic opportunity that a certain scene by virtue of its inherent poetical character must possess—an opportunity which, amid the weltering material of the play, the playwright made for himself.

The fifth and last scene of Act II., portraying the death of Mortimer, belongs intimately to its predecessor, the Temple Garden scene, as further explanatory. It is unhistoric in setting, and like its forerunner, its creation is purely for a dramatic purpose. After the exciting scene in the Temple Garden Plantagenet hastens to the Tower to greet his imprisoned uncle, Mortimer, and to receive his dying benedictions. In a weak and dying state Mortimer is brought on the stage like the dying John of Gaunt in *Richard II.* and the persecuted Queen Katharine in *Henry VIII.* The insertion of the genealogy, as reason for the contention in the Garden and for future struggles, is a method repeated in later history plays, notably in *Henry V.*, under similar compunction. It is a union of dramatic and epic offices like the part of the Chorus and follows older Senecan tradition.

The figure of Richard Plantagenet, as does that of Warwick, connects the First Part intimately with Part III., as the two pairs of characters, Gloucester and Winchester, Suffolk and Margaret, connect it closely with Part II. Something like Hamlet, Plantagenet affirms near the close of this scene :

“ Well, I will lock his counsel in my breast ;
And what I do imagine let that rest.” (II. v. 118–119.)

It is a fitting inheritance ; for it is Plantagenet’s son who is the terrible Gloucester of Part III. and the monstrous Richard III.

In the Parliament scene both sets of quarrels are dramatically brought together. A seeming reconciliation is patched up between Gloucester and Winchester ; and the ideal villainy of Shakespeare is represented, that of dissimulation :

“ *Glou.* So help me God, as I dissemble not !
Win. [*Aside.*] So help me God, as I intend it not !”
(III. i. 140, 141.)

It is the method of Aaron the Moor and Tamora in *Titus Andronicus*, of Richard III., of Don John in *Much Ado*, of Iago, and of the latter’s diminutive in devilishness, Iachimo. In the general aversion shown towards Cardinal Winchester, a feeling that reaches its height in the death scene in Part II., we are reminded of the disinclination portrayed towards a greater Cardinal in *Henry VIII.*¹ One quarrel thus seemingly sealed, by a clever dramatic touch the other, smouldering, breaks out at the same moment. It is determined by the King and an apparently united council on Plantagenet’s behalf :

¹ Were Shakespeare not the most objective and least personal of all writers, we could imagine we might almost trace the Reformer in this portrayal, strengthened as it is by the religious individualism left standing in Talbot’s religious exclamations cited above (p. 304). But as much or more could be brought on the other side, and it is always safest in principle to consider the dramatic effectiveness of scenes, and not fancy any possible personal or symbolical interpretation.

"That Richard be restored to his blood. . . .
And rise created princely Duke of York."

(III. i. 159, 173.)

All shout in seeming unison, but precisely like the Cardinal before, Somerset, remembering the Temple Garden scene, mutters a dissent :

All. Welcome, high prince, the mighty Duke of York !

Som. [Aside]. Perish, base prince, ignoble Duke of York !"

(III. i. 177, 178.)

The evident use of stichomythia, together with word and sound repetition in both instances, heightens the intended antithesis. But, as in others of Shakespeare's early plays, it is an effect of opera rather than that of pure drama.

The young King is not introduced until the Parliament scene in Act III., although his name is given to the play in its present form. And justly so, as in the title rôle of the *Merchant of Venice* and of *Julius Caesar*. All the dissensions among the nobles, those of Gloucester and Winchester, and of Plantagenet and Somerset, cluster about Henry. The Talbot portion has become subordinated to him, as it becomes associated with him and his history. The spirit of the King's weakness, of his scrupulous religiousness, of his oratorical, poetic, and philosophic gifts, emphasized in Parts II. and III., are all intimated in Part I. As the struggles of the Parliament scene rage about him, his first speech, chiding Gloucester and Winchester, reveals his delicate and susceptible nature, finding expression in moralizings and dissertations :

"O, what a scandal is it to our crown,
That two such noble peers as ye should jar !"

(III. i. 69, 70.)

And again :

"O, how this discord doth afflict my soul !" (III. i. 106.)

But he is both too young and too weak to effect a conclusion. One act later (IV. i.), when the Plantagenet and Somerset quarrel is repeated in miniature by their followers,

Vernon and Bassett, the King fearful for all differences of opinion, again strives for quiet, but as a poet :

“Let me be umpire in this doubtful strife.
I see no reason, if I wear this rose [*Putting on a red rose*],
That any one should therefore be suspicious,
I more incline to Somerset than York :
Both are my kinsmen, and I love them both.” (IV. i. 151-155.)

This is the fatal action that determines York’s hostility to the King—an opposition that ends only with the death of Richard on Bosworthfield. Small wonder there is the comment of Warwick :

“My Lord of York, I promise you, the king
Prettily, methought, did play the orator.”

To which York replies :

“And so he did ; but yet I like it not,
In that he wears the badge of Somerset.
Warwick. Tush, that was but his fancy, blame him not ;
I dare presume, sweet prince, he thought no harm.
York. An if I wist he hid—but let it rest ; . . .” (IV. ii. 174-180.)

It is the same “sweet prince,” who “thought no harm,” that in Part III., in another “fancy,” could sit on a hillside, and wish himself, not with poor brain-troubled Lear, “every inch a king,” but a silly swain :

“Ah, what a life were this ! how sweet ! how lovely !” (II. v. 41.)

Do we ask about the authorship of the play ? We cannot be too sure. There are too many difficulties on all sides to be too dogmatic in any conclusion. It seems folly to suppose with Mr. Fleay¹ that individual lines and scenes can with any degree of certainty be awarded to A and B and C and

¹F. G. Fleay : *A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare*, 1886.

D and E. Mr. Richard Grant White,¹ like others, became absorbed in the many delicate questions involved in Parts II. and III. and found little space to devote to Part I., but adhered in a general way to A, B, C, and D. Mr. Swinburne's² eloquent denunciation is the feeling of a poet, but is clearly susceptible of limitations. As Professor Sarrazin³ has pointed out, the Talbot figure in the play seems to have derived an impulse from Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, and the tenderness of father and son recalls episodes in the *Spanish Tragedy* of Kyd. Also there is a wooing of another Margaret by proxy in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*; and the sentiment of the couplet,

"She's beautiful and therefore to be woo'd;
She is a woman, therefore to be won"— (V. iii. 77, 98.)

again repeated in both *Titus Andronicus* and *Richard III.*, has been traced to Greene's *Planetomachia*. But we are not bound to conclude joint authorship of all these and others, but only influence, as Prof. Sarrazin wisely suggests. But he, it seems, returning to the view of Charles Knight,⁴ wishes to accept every word, every line and every circumstance, as traceable to Shakespeare. This, in turn, may go too far; for certain parts of the French and Joan scenes at least may have been left virtually unchanged, if we accept the intervention of an older Talbot play. Mr. Dowden⁵ believes it

¹ R. G. White: *Essay on the authorship of the three parts of King Henry the Sixth*; Vol. VII of "Works of William Shakespeare," 1859.

² A. C. Swinburne: *A Study of Shakespeare*, 3d edition, 1895.

³ G. Sarrazin: *William Shakespeare's Lehrjahre*, 1897.

⁴ Charles Knight: *Pictorial Edition of Shakespeare, Supplement to Histories*, Vol. II.

⁵ Edward Dowden: *Shakspeare Primer*, 1877, p. 62. In the *Introduction to Shakespeare*, 1895, Mr. Dowden expresses the same opinion: "The authorship of the first part of Henry VI. is not ascertained; it probably received additions from Shakespeare's hand; . . . it is essentially pre-Shakespearian."

Mr. Sidney Lee, in his *Life of William Shakespeare*, 1898, p. 59, helps us but little further: "In 'The First Part of Henry VI.' the scene in the Temple Gardens, where white and red roses are plucked as emblems by

"is almost certainly an old play, by one or more authors, which . . . had received touches from the hands of Shakespeare," but enters upon no details. Other recent commentators follow in the paths of the older ones, get around the obstructions they see ahead as best they can, and by ignoring the difficulties, have little or nothing to say.

My own endeavor has been to see what can be found, by an analysis, in the play itself. If the apparent results, gained by a study of the structure, can be accepted; if there be an original Talbot portion, based either on an older play or directly upon the chronicles, adapted and strengthened by dramatic emphasis upon Talbot's character and Talbot's death, and expanded into a Henry VI. drama, and thus given a place in a larger tetralogy;—the person ordering this material and effecting these changes, in other words, the real creator of the play as it stands, could well be Shakespeare near the beginning of his art. At least one principle is clear. By a study of the earliest plays attributed to Shakespeare, for themselves and in their historic and comparative relations, there will be found to be more and more points in common with the Shakespeare of the later plays;—not yet in the fulness of his power, but at any rate with suggestions of the method, structure, habit of thought, characterization, and art of the master to be.

JOHN BELL HENNEMAN.

the rival political parties (Act II., sc. iv.), the dying speech of Mortimer, and perhaps the wooing of Margaret by Suffolk, alone bear the impress of his style." This is in substantial agreement with what Mr. Dowden had already said in his *Primer*. It is unfortunate that neither Mr. Dowden's nor Mr. Lee's plan permitted the critic to enter upon a detailed discussion of the play.